

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 13, 1997 LB 422

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, members of the Legislature, there's a misperception on the part of the media and a lot of other people. Their understanding is so shallow that they think any time I engage in extended debate it ought to be called a filibuster. But when we get to the budget you're going to have all these other people talking for hours on end and not one time will they call it a filibuster. It happens that I'm the one who has sufficient interest and will take the time to carry us through this bill. Senator Matzke has not called it a filibuster. Not one amendment that I've offered has he said is frivolous, not one time has he considered what I'm doing to be dilatory. He opened the discussion by pointing out how complex and serious this matter is. So I can't tell the media how to do their jobs. And when they blunder and bungle in the way they do, they take their shots, I'm going to take mine. They show to me a lack of awareness, a certain incompetency, an inability to understand what is happening. So I'm going to tell them, listen up media, put your thinking caps on. If this were a filibuster everybody would know it without you having to tell them. A filibuster would exist if every opportunity I had to speak I would take it. If when Senator Matzke has agreed to something, despite his agreement, I would continue to talk, and talk, and talk. This will not be the first time, when he has said that he agrees with an amendment, then I said that's fine. There will be no need for me to say anything else. This morning we had an amendment, which I didn't even accept my close on. I see why some of these people are...oh, let me say this, my closing, Senator Janssen, I misspoke. I shouldn't say "close on", because some people might spell that c-l-o-s-e-s and think that I had crossed the line, and not only did I want the truth to be naked but myself. And I'll assure the media that that is not what I intended. And had I written the word, it would have been clear what I meant. But I can't take chances with them now, in view of their lack of understanding. Since Senator Matzke and Senator Bromm agree with this amendment to the amendment, ever though they say they will reject the underlying one, I take it a step at a time. So I'm asking that we accept the amendment to the amendment, then we can deal with the amendment in the form that I would want it and the form that Senator Matzke would want it, if he were going to support it. He agrees that this language that my amendment that we're